UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,037	06/24/2003	Cristian Petculescu	MSFT-1587/302202.1	1781

41505 7590 10/29/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER	
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/603,037	PETCULESCU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6,8-9,11,13-16,18-24,26-27,29-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6,8,9,11,13-16,18-24,26,27 and 29-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 June 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1,3-6,8-9,11,13-16,18-24,26-27,29-48 are presented for examination

2. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 8/25/2008

3. Claims 1, 11, 13-16, 18-20, 27, 29, 33-40 have been amended [8/25/2008].

4. Claims 2, 7, 10, 12,17,25,28 have been cancelled.

5. In view of applicant's amendment to claims 13-16,18-19,33-39, the claim objections as set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. In view of applicant amendment to claims 1,3-6,8-11,13-16,18-24,26-27,29-48, the rejection under 35 USC 112 first paragraph as set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. In view of applicant's canceling claim 10, the rejection under 35 USC 101 as set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn. However, examiner hereby maintains 35 USC 101 rejection to claims 27,29-31 as set forth in the previous office action is as follows:

8. Claims 27,29-31 lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. ***Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-24, 26-27, and 29-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colossi et al. ("Relational extensions for OLAP, IBM Systems Journal, Vol. 41, No. 4, 2002, pages 714-731, Accepted for publication August 19, 2002) in view of*** **Egilsson*et al. [hereafter*** **Egilsson]* ** **US 20030145004 filed on June 25 2005**

12. With respect to claim 1, Colossi teaches defining a dimension comprising a plurality of attributes (i.e., a dimension in OLAP, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, and fig. 6 on page 724; a dimension object, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725).

Colossi teaches assigning each attribute to a respective column of the database having restrictions therein (i.e., attribute and join of dimension, fig. 6 on page 724 and "Base/relational layer" on page 725; the restrictions are that the columns are bounded to their respective tables).

Colossi teaches defining relationships between said attributes of the defined dimension (i.e., dimension hierarchy, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, and "Base/relational layer" on page 725), said defined relationships not being subject to said restrictions of the database (i.e., multiple hierarchies of dimension, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725); Colossi also teaches said defined relationships establishing a first hierarchy of the attributes with respect to the

defined dimension (page 715, col 2, “OLAP” basics, fig 2), Colossi specifically teaches three dimensional OLAP cube where each dimension for example “product, time, and location” dimensions are part of the “cube”, further members of each dimension arranged in parent-child relationship i.e., organized into a “hierarchical levels, see fig 2), therefore, Colossi teaches not only defining each dimension, establishing relationship between dimensions, but also arranged in hierarchical level , first hierarchy corresponds to “time dimension” having year and month arranged in hierarchical level having attributes as detailed in fig 2

Colossi teaches accessing the database via at least one of the first hierarchy and the second hierarchy of said dimension (i.e., a relational database is accessed via dimension, "OLAP sales cube example" on pages 725-726, fig. 8 on page 726, fig. 6 on page 724, and fig. 5 on page 722 , page 724, col 2, fig 7). Further it is noted that Colossi specifically teaches “cube model” based on “star schema” that supports multiple hierarchical level of each dimension for example “time dimension” in fig 4 typically establishing relationship between “different hierarchies”, therefore, Colossi teaches first hierarchy and second hierarchy of dimension as shown in fig 7

Colossi does not explicitly disclose defining new relationships between said attributes of the defined dimension, said new defined relationships establishing a second hierarchy of the attributes with respect to the defined dimension; said new relationships not being subject to said restrictions of the database; said new relationships of the second hierarchy modifying at least one relationship of the first hierarchy between said attributes’.

On the other hand, Egilsson*et* teaches defining new relationships between said attributes, of the defined dimension [fig 6-7], defining new relationship between attributes corresponds to Egilsson*et's* fig 7, element 703 and 704; 'said new defined relationships establishing a second hierarchy of the attributes with respect to the defined dimension, said new relationships not being subject to said restrictions of the database [0073, 0122,0124, 0146, fig 6-7] , Egilsson*et* specifically teaches establishing new relationship between attributes in second dimension table related to second hierarchy such as detailed in fig 7; 'said new relationships of the second hierarchy modifying at least one relationship of the first hierarchy between said attributes' [fig 6-7, page 6, 0124, page 7, 0137-0138], Egilsson*et* suggests editing or modifying specific hierarchical levels and using rewriting algorithm, rewriting multiple levels from several dimensions [page 7, 0138],

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of "editing dimensional structure of multidimensional data cube of Egilsson*et* with relational extensions for "OLAP" particularly three-dimensional OLAP cube of Colossi because both Colossi, Egilsson*et* specifically teach "multidimensional data cube [see Colossi: fig 2; Egilsson*et* : page 2, 0029], both Colossi, Egilssonef supports relational database using SQL [Colossi: page 719, col 1, page 720; Egilsson*et* : page 6, 0123-0129], and both Colossi, Egilssonet supports start schema [Colossi: page 718, col 1, 2nd paragraph; Egilsson*et* : fig 2, fig 5], and both Colossi, Egilsson*et* are from same field of multidimensional data cube. Because both Collosi, Egilsson*et* teach multidimensional data cube used in relational

database for query, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to edit various dimensional levels particularly updating and rewiring dimensional tables to achieve the predictable result related to new dimensional tables, further ensuring data cube properties, and satisfying attribute wide criteria in each dimensional hierarchy, thus improving overall quality and reliability of the multidimensional database system.

13. With respect to claim 3, Colossi teaches defining at least one hierarchy comprising a sequence of the attributes, at least one of said attributes included in said defining relationship step (i.e., dimension hierarchy, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725).

14. With respect to claim 4, Colossi teaches each hierarchy defines a drill down path for accessing the database (i.e., Drill-down, fig. 3 on page 718 and left column on page 717).

15. With respect to claim 5, Colossi teaches a hierarchy contains one attribute (i.e., dimension hierarchy, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725).

16. With respect to claim 6, Colossi teaches the act of defining the at least one hierarchy is independent of the database (i.e., multiple hierarchies of dimension, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725).

17. With respect to claim 8, Colossi teaches the database is a relational database (i.e., a relational database in fig. 6 on page 724).

18. With respect to claim 9, Colossi teaches the dimension is utilized with an on line analysis processing (OLAP) system ("OLAP basics" on pages 715-719).

19. With respect to claim 10, Colossi teaches an application programming interface (API) comprising means for performing the method of claim 1 (fig. 1 on page 716 and upper right column on page 715).

20. Claims 11, 13-16, and 18-19 are essentially the same as claims 1,3-6, and 8-9 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer-readable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

21. Claims 20-24 and 26 are essentially the same as claims 1,3-6 and 8-9 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method, wherein for claim 20, Colossi further teaches a processor coupled to a storage device, the storage

device comprising a database (fig. 1 on page 716, fig. 3 on page 718, fig. 10 on page 727, and left column on page 717), therefore, claims 20-24 and 26 are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

22. Claims 27 and 29-31 are essentially the same as claims 1,3, 6, and 9-10, further [claim 29 limitation], Colossi specifically suggests each dimension have set of related members, and members of a dimension are arranged in hierarchical levels particularly “parent-child relationship of levels within a dimension is part of OLAP basics [page 715, col 2; also see Egilsson*et* :fig 5-7], except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

23. The limitations of claims 32-39 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1,3-6, and 8-9, and these claims are rejected on that basis, wherein for claim 37, Colossi further teaches the logical structure is defined independent of restrictions associated with the database (i.e., multiple hierarchies of dimension, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725).

24. With respect to claim 40, the limitations of claim 40 are similar to the limitations of claim 1 above. Colossi further teaches receiving a data retrieval request including a dimension ("Execute Web service" on pages 728-730). Therefore, the limitations of

claim 40 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

25. With respect to claim 41, Colossi teaches providing the retrieved data in response to the data retrieval request (fig. 9 on page 727 and fig. 3 on page 718).

26. With respect to claim 42, Colossi teaches the data retrieval request further including at least hierarchy comprising a sequence of the attributes, where at least one of said attributes in included in the said at least one defined relationship (i.e., a drill up/down operation request, fig. 3 on page 718 and left column on page 717; dimension hierarchy, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725).

27. With respect to claim 43, Colossi teaches each hierarchy defines a drill down path for accessing the database (i.e., Drill-down, fig. 3 on page 718 and left column on page 717).

28. With respect to claim 44, Colossi teaches a hierarchy contains one attribute (i.e., dimension hierarchy, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725).

29. With respect to claim 45, Colossi teaches each sequence is defined independent of said restrictions associated with the database (i.e., multiple hierarchies of dimension, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725).

30. With respect to claim 46, Colossi teaches the relationships between the attributes are defined independent of said restrictions associated with the database (i.e., multiple hierarchies of dimension, "OLAP basics" on page 715, fig. 2 on page 717, fig. 6 on page 724, "Multidimensional layer" on pages 724-725, "Base/relational layer" on page 725, and fig. 7 on page 725).

31. With respect to claim 47, Colossi teaches the database is a relational database (i.e., a relational database in fig. 6 on page 724).

32. With respect to claim 48, Colossi teaches the database is capable of being utilized with an on line analysis processing (OLAP) system ("OLAP basics" on pages 715-719).

Response to Arguments

33. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,3-6,8-9,11,13-16,18-24,26-27, 29-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

a) At page 13-14, examiner noted applicant arguments with respect 35 USC 101 rejection as set forth in the previous office action. However, examiner disagrees with the Appellant in finding that all of the claims in the application are invalid under 35 USC 101.

As stated in the above office action, claims 27,29-31 lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. further, examiner finds that the claims 27,29-31 in the instant application [software routines or merely algorithms] share the same characteristics as the claims in Gottshcalk. For example, claim 27 in the instant application are directed to "A system for accessing a database having restrictions therein, said system comprising: means for defining a dimension …attributes; "means for assigning each attribute to a ….therein; "means for defining relationships between said attributes…..defined dimension; "means for defining new relationships….defined dimension, wherein said new relationships….of the database; and said new relationships of ….said attributes; and means for accessing said database.....said dimensiion" is equivalent to machine-implemented abstract idea. These claims 27,29-31 are (i) so abstract and sweeping as

to cover both known and unknown uses of the underlying "software algorithm" (ii) so abstract and sweeping as to be applicable to a wide variety of unrelated applications.

As noted from the claims in Gottschalk, [Gottschalk v Benson] were directed to a mathematical method running on a computer: converting binary-coded-decimal (BCD) numerals into pure binary numerals for use with general purpose digital computer of any type. [see Gottshcalk at 65].

The Supreme Court held in "Gottschalk" that "one may not patent an idea. But in practical effect that would be the result if the formula for converting BCD numerals to pure binary numerals were patented in this case. The mathematical formula involved here has no substantial practical application except in connection with a digital computer, which means that if the judgment below is affirmed, the patent would wholly pre-empt the mathematical formula and in practical effect would be a patent on the algorithm itself [see Gottshcalk at 71-72]. Therefore, whether a claim recites a machine implemented process is not determinative of whether that process claim is statutory. Thus, a claim that is nothing more than a machine-implemented abstract idea is invalid.

Moreover, the Supreme Court also held that "[h]ere the "process" claim is so abstract and sweeping as to cover both known and unknown uses of the BCD to pure binary conversion. The end use may (1) vary from the operation of a train [,] to verification of drivers' licenses [,] to researching the law books for precedents [;] and (2) be performed through any existing machinery or future-devised machinery or without any apparatus. [see Gottshcalk at 68].

Examiner also notes that "*State Street" Bank & Trust Co v Signature Financial Group Inc*". As best understood by the Examiner, "State Street" was decided by a lower court, and therefore does not overrule the Supreme Court decision in Gottshcalk, Further examiner interprets the holding in **State Street** to be narrow in scope: that a dollar value output is a "concrete, useful, tangble" result. The decision says so expressly [see State Street at 1373].

Also, examiner notes that the CAFC has upheld other computer-implemented algorithm claims, where the outputs were narrowly claimed [see AT&T Corp v. Excel Communications, Inc., 172 F.3d 1352 (Fed.Cir.1999) (upholding claims directed to a long-distance telephone billing process containing mathematical algorithms that generated PIC codes); In re Alappat, 33 F.3rd 1526 (Fed.Cir.1994) (upholding claims directed to computer-implemented mathematical algorithms that generated smooth waveform display on a rasterized monitor); Arrhythmia Research Technology Inc. v. Corazonix Corp., 958 F. 2d 1053 22 USPQ2d 1033 (Fed.Cir.1992) (upholding claims directed to the transformation of electrocardiograph signals from a patient's heartbeat by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations that output the condition of a patient's heart).

b) At page 14-16, applicant argues that "neither of such references discloses that the restrictions of the database are not imosed on the hierarchies of the dimension…….Accordingly, neither the Petculescu reference nor the Colossi reference

discloses that each defined hierarchy of a single dimension may be employed to search a database as is recited n the claims.

34. As to the above argument [b], In view of applicant amendment to claims, examiner rejected *Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-24, 26-27, and 29-48 obvious over Colossi et al. ("Relational extensions for OLAP, IBM Systems Journal, Vol. 41, No. 4, 2002, pages 714-731, Accepted for publication August 19, 2002) in view of* Egilsson*et al. [hereafter* Egilsson] US 20030145004 filed on June 25 2005 as clearly stated above, further, one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller,* 642 F.2d 413,208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.* 800 F.2d 1091,231 USPQ 375 (Fed.Cir. 1986).

In this case, Colossi specifically teaches “multi dimensional OLAP cube”, particularly each dimension have set of related members, and members of a dimension are arranged in a “hierarchy of levels” for example time, location, product dimensions of the cube as detailed in fig 2, page 715, col 1, “OLAP basics”, and Colossi also teaches defining not only deminsions,in a cube, but also establishing relationship between various attributes for example as detailed in page 715, fig 2, fig 6, page 717, 724.

As noted Colossi discloses restrictins of the database are not imposed on the hierarchies of the dimension [see page 715, 717,724-725, , fig 2, fig 6] because it allows base/relational layers supports multidimensional abstraction over the relational

database, further allows for various operations for example drill-down, drill up, and cube operations.

It is however, noted that Colossi does not explicitly disclose defining new relationships between said attributes of the defined dimension, said new defined relationships establishing a second hierarchy of the attributes with respect to the defined dimension; said new relationships not being subject to said restrictions of the database; said new relationships of the second hierarchy modifying at least one relationship of the first hierarchy between said attributes'.

On the other hand, Egilsson*et* teaches defining new relationships between said attributes, of the defined dimension [fig 6-7], defining new relationship between attributes corresponds to Egilsson*et's* fig 7, element 703 and 704; 'said new defined relationships establishing a second hierarchy of the attributes with respect to the defined dimension, said new relationships not being subject to said restrictions of the database [0073, 0122,0124, 0146, fig 6-7] , Egilsson*et* specifically teaches establishing new relationship between attributes in second dimension table related to second hierarchy such as detailed in fig 7; 'said new relationships of the second hierarchy modifying at least one relationship of the first hierarchy between said attributes' [fig 6-7, page 6, 0124, page 7, 0137-0138], Egilsson*et* suggests editing or modifying specific hierarchical levels and using rewriting algorithm, rewriting multiple levels from several dimensions [page 7, 0138],

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of "editing dimensional structure of

multidimensional data cube of Egilsson*et* with relational extensions for "OLAP" particularly three-dimensional OLAP cube of Colossi because both Colossi, Egilsson*et* specifically teach "multidimensional data cube [see Colossi: fig 2; Egilsson*et* : page 2, 0029], both Colossi, Egilssonef supports relational database using SQL [Colossi: page 719, col 1, page 720; Egilsson*et* : page 6, 0123-0129], and both Colossi, Egilssonet supports start schema [Colossi: page 718, col 1, 2nd paragraph; Egilsson*et* : fig 2, fig 5], and both Colossi, Egilsson*et* are from same field of multidimensional data cube. Because both Collosi, Egilsson*et* teach multidimensional data cube used in relational database for query, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to edit various dimensional levels particularly updating and rewiring dimensional tables l to achieve the predictable result related to new dimensional tables, further ensuring data cube properties, and satisfying attribute wide criteria in each dimensional hierarchy, thus improving overall quality and reliability of the multidimensional database system..

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

US Pub. No. 20030145004

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

/Srirama Channavajjala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166
10/14/08